arXiv:1304.2706v2 [math.AP] 16 May 2013

PARTIAL REGULARITY FOR SINGULAR SOLUTIONS TO THE MONGE-AMPÈRE EQUATION

CONNOR MOONEY

Abstract. We prove that solutions to the Monge-Ampère inequality

$$\det D^2u \geq 1$$

in $\mathbb{R}^n$ are strictly convex away from a singular set of Hausdorff $n-1$ dimensional measure zero. Furthermore, we show this is optimal by constructing solutions to $\det D^2u = 1$ with singular set of Hausdorff dimension as close as we like to $n-1$. As a consequence we obtain $W^{2,1}$ regularity for the Monge-Ampère equation with bounded right hand side and unique continuation for the Monge-Ampère equation with sufficiently regular right hand side.

1. Introduction

In this paper we investigate the Hausdorff dimension of the set where Alexandrov solutions (see Section 2 for the precise definition) to

$$\det D^2u \geq 1$$

are not strictly convex. Recall that we say that a convex function u is strictly convex at x_0 if there exists L_{x_0}, a supporting tangent plane at x_0, such that

$$\{u = L_{x_0}\} = x_0.$$

Our main theorem is:

Theorem 1.1. *Assume u is an Alexandrov solution to*

$$\det D^2u \geq 1$$

in $B_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. Then u is strictly convex away from a singular set Σ with

$$\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\Sigma) = 0.$$

We show this is optimal by constructing solutions to $\det D^2u = 1$ with singular set of Hausdorff dimension as close as we like to $n-1$. This result is interesting especially for $n \geq 3$ since it is well-known that in two dimensions solutions to $\det D^2u \geq 1$ are strictly convex.

Theorem 1.1 has several applications to the regularity theory for singular solutions to the Monge-Ampère equation with bounded right hand side, which we now describe.

Caffarelli developed a regularity theory of solutions to

$$\det D^2u = f \quad \text{in } \Omega, \qquad \lambda \leq f \leq \Lambda$$

at points where u is strictly convex. We briefly summarize the main results. We define a section of u at x with height h and slope p by

$$S_{h,p}(x) = \{y \in \Omega : u(y) < u(x) + p \cdot (y-x) + h\}$$

for some subgradient p at x. If u is strictly convex at x then we can find a subgradient p such that the supporting plane of this slope touches only at x, and then take h small enough that $S_{h,p}(x) \subset\subset \Omega$. In this setting, Caffarelli ([C1],[C2]) showed that

(i) u is strictly convex in $S_{h,p}(x)$ and $u \in C^{1,\alpha}_{loc}(S_{h,p}(x))$,
(ii) If $f \in C^{\alpha}(\Omega)$ then $u \in C^{2,\alpha}_{loc}(S_{h,p}(x))$, and
(iii) For every $p > 1$ there is some $\epsilon(p) > 0$ such that if $|f - 1| < \epsilon$ then $u \in W^{2,p}_{loc}(S_{h,p}(x))$.

However, these regularity theorems fail at points where u is not strictly convex. Consider the well-known Pogorelov examples on $B_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^n, \quad n \geq 3$ which degenerate along $x' = (x_1, ..., x_{n-1}) = 0$. One constructs these examples by seeking solutions of the form $|x'| + |x'|^{\beta} g(x_n)$ and $|x'|^{\alpha} f(x_n)$. The first is

$$|x'| + |x'|^{n/2}(1 + x_n^2),$$

which solves $\lambda \leq \det D^2 u \leq \Lambda$ but is merely Lipschitz. The second is

$$|x'|^{2-2/n}(1 + x_n^2),$$

which solves $\det D^2 u = f$ with f strictly positive and smooth, but is only $C^{1,\alpha}$ for $\alpha = 1 - 2/n$ and $W^{2,p}$ for $p < \frac{n(n-1)}{2}$.

In [C3], Caffarelli generalizes these examples to solutions that degenerate along subspaces of any dimension less than $\frac{n}{2}$, and shows that it is not possible to find solutions degenerating on subspaces of dimension $\frac{n}{2}$ or higher. We provide a short proof in the next section (see Lemma 2.3). If u agrees with a linear function L on a k-dimensional set, we say that $\{u = L\}$ is a k-dimensional singularity. Our proof of Theorem 1.1 in fact shows that the collection of k-dimensional singularities has Hausdorff $n - k$ dimensional measure zero (see Remark 3.4).

Since we cannot hope for C^1 regularity or $W^{2,p}$ regularity of singular solutions to $\lambda \leq \det D^2 u \leq \Lambda$ for large p, it is natural to ask what we can show about the integrability of the second derivatives. De Philippis, Figalli and Savin ([DFS],[DF]) recently showed $W^{2,1+\epsilon}$ regularity of strictly convex solutions to $\lambda \leq \det D^2 u \leq \Lambda$, where ϵ depends only on λ, Λ and n. Our main theorem rules out the possibility that the second derivatives concentrate on Σ:

Theorem 1.2. *Let u be a solution to*

$$\lambda \leq \det D^2 u \leq \Lambda$$

in $B_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. Then $u \in W^{2,1}_{loc}(B_1)$.

We also show that Theorem 1.2 is optimal by proving that the examples giving optimality of Theorem 1.1 are not in $W^{2,1+\epsilon}$ for ϵ as small as we like.

A second consequence of Theorem 1.1 is that the points of strict convexity for u form a connected set when f is bounded away from 0. If f is sufficiently regular we obtain unique continuation for the Monge-Ampère equation:

Theorem 1.3. *Assume that*

$$\det D^2 u = \det D^2 v = f$$

in an open connected set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, with $f \in C^{1,\alpha}(\Omega)$ strictly positive. If $u = v$ on an open subset of Ω, then $u \equiv v$ in Ω.

To our knowledge, these are the first Sobolev regularity and unique continuation results for singular solutions to the Monge-Ampère equation.

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2 we present basic geometric properties of the sections of solutions to $\det D^2u \geq 1$. In particular, we present an important estimate on the volume growth of sections that are not compactly contained and relate the volume of compactly contained sections to the Monge-Ampère mass of these sections. In section 3 we use these results at singular points together with the useful technique of replacing u by $u + \frac{1}{2}|x|^2$ to prove Theorem 1.1. In section 4 we construct, for any δ, a solution to $\det D^2u = 1$ with a singular set of Hausdorff dimension $n-1-\delta$, which shows that our main theorem is optimal. In section 5 we use Theorem 1.1 to prove Theorem 1.2 and we show that the examples constructed in section 4 are not in $W^{2,1+\epsilon}$ for ϵ as small as we like, which shows that $W^{2,1}$ regularity is optimal. Finally, in section 6 we prove Theorem 1.3 by applying a classical unique continuation theorem in the set of strict convexity.

In future work we intend to present a more precise, quantitative version of our main theorem to obtain $L\log L$ estimates for the second derivatives of singular solutions to $\lambda \leq \det D^2u \leq \Lambda$.

Acknowledgements

This work is part of my forthcoming doctoral dissertation at Columbia University. I would like to thank my thesis advisor Ovidiu Savin for his patient guidance and for his feedback on the the drafts of this paper. I would also like to thank Jun Kitagawa, Nam Le and Yu Wang for helpful comments.

The author was partially supported by the NSF Graduate Research Fellowship Program under grant number DGE 1144155.

2. Preliminaries

We first recall the precise definition of Alexandrov solutions. Any convex function $v : \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ has an associated Borel measure Mv, called the Monge-Ampère measure, defined by

$$Mv(A) = |\nabla v(A)|$$

where $|\nabla v(A)|$ represents the Lebesgue measure of the image of the subgradients of v in A (see [Gut]). If $v \in C^2$, then

$$|\nabla v(A)| = \int_A \det D^2 v\, dx.$$

Given a Borel measure μ, we say that v is an Alexandrov solution to

$$\det D^2 v = \mu$$

if $Mv = \mu$.

For a convex function v defined on $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, we define a section $S_{h,p}(x)$ by

$$S_{h,p}(x) = \{y \in \Omega : v(y) < v(x) + p \cdot (y-x) + h\}$$

for some subgradient p at x. We now present some results on the geometry of the sections.

Lemma 2.1. *(John's Lemma). If $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a bounded convex set with nonempty interior, and 0 is the center of mass of K, then there exists an ellipsoid E and a dimensional constant $C(n)$ such that*

$$E \subset K \subset C(n)E.$$

We call E the John ellipsoid of K. There is some linear transformation A such that $A(B_1) = E$, and we say that A normalizes K.

The next lemma is an important observation about the volume growth of sections which may not be compactly contained in Ω:

Lemma 2.2. *Assume that $\det D^2u \geq 1$ in $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. Then if $S_{h,p}(x)$ is any section of u, we have*

$$|S_{h,p}(x)| \leq Ch^{n/2}$$

for some constant C depending only on n.

Proof. Assume by translation that 0 is the center of mass of $S_{h,p}(x)$. By subtracting a linear function we can assume that

$$p = 0, \quad u|_{\partial S_{h,0}(x)} \leq 0, \text{ and } \quad |\min_{S_{h,0}(x)} u| = h.$$

By John's Lemma, there is a linear transformation A that normalizes $S_{h,0}(x)$. Let

$$\tilde{u}(x) = |\det A|^{-2/n} u(Ax).$$

It is easy to check that

$$\det D^2\tilde{u} \geq 1, \quad \tilde{u}|_{\partial\tilde{\Omega}} \leq 0$$

where $B_1 \subset \tilde{\Omega} \subset B_{C(n)}$. Then $\frac{1}{2}(|x|^2 - 1)$ is an upper barrier for $\tilde{u}$, so

$$|\min_{\tilde{\Omega}} \tilde{u}| \geq \frac{1}{2}.$$

Since $|\det A| \geq c(n)|S_{h,0}(x)|$, the conclusion follows. □

Caffarelli proved the next proposition in [C3]. We provide a short proof using a technique related to our proof of the main theorem.

Lemma 2.3. *Assume*

$$\det D^2u \geq 1$$

in $B_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. Then u cannot vanish on a subspace of dimension $\frac{n}{2}$ or higher.

Proof. Suppose u vanishes on

$$\{x_{k+1} = ... = x_n = 0\}.$$

By subtracting a linear function of the form $a_{k+1}x_{k+1} + ... + a_nx_n$ we may assume that $u(te_n) = o(t)$. Then $S_{h,0}(0)$ has length $R(h)h$ in the e_n direction, where $R(h) \to \infty$ as $h \to 0$. Furthermore, $S_{h,0}(0)$ has length exceeding $\frac{1}{C}h$ in the $e_{n-k}, ..., e_{n-1}$ directions, where C is the Lipschitz constant of u in $B_{1/2}$. Finally, $S_{h,0}(0)$ contains the unit ball in the subspace spanned by $\{e_1, ..., e_k\}$. We conclude that

$$|S_{h,0}(0)| \geq C^{-k}R(h)h^{n-k},$$

which contradicts Lemma 2.2 as $h \to 0$ for $k \geq \frac{n}{2}$. □

In particular, every solution to $\det D^2u \geq 1$ in two dimensions is strictly convex.

We conclude the section with the following variant of Alexandrov's maximum principle. In the following $c(n), C(n)$ denote small and large constants depending only on n, and their values may change from line to line.

Lemma 2.4. *Let v be any convex function on $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with $v|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$. Then*

$$Mv(\Omega)\,|\Omega| \geq c(n)|\min_{\Omega} v|^n.$$

Proof. By translation assume that the center of mass of Ω is 0. Let A normalize Ω and let

$$\tilde{v}(x) = (\det A)^{-2/n} v(Ax).$$

Then

$$M\tilde{v}(\tilde{\Omega}) = (\det A)^{-1} Mv(\Omega)$$

with $B_1 \subset \tilde{\Omega} \subset B_{C(n)}$.

The maximum of $|\tilde{v}|$ is achieved at some point $\tilde{x} \in \tilde{\Omega}$. Let K be the function whose graph is the cone generated by $(\tilde{x}, \tilde{v}(x))$ and $\partial B_{C(n)}$. By convexity,

$$M\tilde{v}(\tilde{\Omega}) \geq |\nabla K(\tilde{x})|.$$

Since $\nabla K(\tilde{x})$ is a ball of radius at least $c(n)|\min_{\tilde{\Omega}} \tilde{v}|$, we have

$$|\nabla K(\tilde{x})| \geq c(n)|\min_{\tilde{\Omega}} \tilde{v}|^n \geq c(n)|\det A|^{-2}|\min_{\Omega} v|^n.$$

Finally, $|\det A| \leq C(n)|\Omega|$ so the conclusion follows. □

3. Proof of Theorem 1.1

In this section assume that

$$\det D^2 u \geq 1$$

in $B_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. Fix $x \in \Sigma$ and a subgradient p at x. By translation and subtracting a linear function assume that $x = p = 0$. Then $\{u = 0\}$ contains a line segment of some length l. By Lemma 2.2,

$$S_{h,0}(0) \leq C(n)h^{n/2}$$

for all $h > 0$.

Letting $v = u + \frac{1}{2}|x|^2$ and denoting the sections of v by $S^v_{h,p}$, it follows that

$$|S^v_{h,0}(0)| \leq \frac{C(n)}{l} h^{\frac{n+1}{2}}$$

for all h small.

Theorem 1.1 thus follows from the following more general result:

Theorem 3.1. *Let v be any convex function on $B_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with sections $S^v_{h,p}$, and let Σ_v denote the set of points x such that for all subgradients p at x, there is some C_p such that*

$$|S^v_{h,p}(x)| < C_p h^{\frac{n+1}{2}}$$

for all h small. Then

$$\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\Sigma_v) = 0.$$

Proof of Theorem 1.1: Let $v = u + \frac{1}{2}|x|^2$. By the discussion preceding the statement of Theorem 3.1, $\Sigma \subset \Sigma_v$. The conclusion follows from Theorem 3.1. $\square$

We briefly discuss the main ideas of the proof. Fix $x \in \Sigma_v$ and a subgradient p at x. In the following analysis c, C will denote small and large constants depending on n and C_p. If $S^v_{h,p}(x) \subset\subset B_1$ then the definition of Σ_v and Lemma 2.4 give

$$Mv(S^v_h(x)) \geq ch^{\frac{n-1}{2}} = c(h^{1/2})^{n-1}$$

for all h small.

An important technique of the proof is to replace v by $v + \frac{1}{2}|x|^2$. Since

$$\Sigma_v \subset \Sigma_{v+\frac{1}{2}|x|^2},$$

it suffices to prove Theorem 3.1 for this case. Then all of the sections are compactly contained in B_1 for h small, and the diameter of sections is at most $h^{1/2}$. By replacing the sections $S^v_{h,p}(x)$ by $B_{\sqrt{h}}(x)$ and using a covering argument, we easily obtain that Σ_v has Hausdorff dimension at most $n-1$.

Lemmas 3.2 and 3.3 improve this result as follows. We aim to rule out behavior like

$$|x|^2 + |x_n|,$$

which has a singular hyperplane. For this example, the sections at $\{x_n = 0\}$ have the correct growth when we take supporting slopes with no x_n-component, but the sections are too large when we take supporting slopes with x_n-component 1.

In the first lemma we use that the sections are small for *all* supporting planes at $x \in \Sigma_v$ to show that v must grow much faster than quadratically in at least two directions, unlike the example above. In the second lemma we use the above observation about the Monge-Ampère mass of v in the directions where v grows much faster than quadratically from x. Since we replaced v by $v + \frac{1}{2}|x|^2$ we also know that v grows at least quadratically in the remaining directions. This allows us to cover Σ_v with balls in which the Monge-Ampère mass of v is much larger than the radius to the $n-1$, giving the desired improvement.

In the following assume we have replaced v by $v + \frac{1}{2}|x|^2$.

Lemma 3.2. *Fix $x \in \Sigma_v$. For a supporting slope p at x, let*

$$d_1(h) \geq d_2(h) \geq ... \geq d_n(h)$$

denote the axis lengths of the John ellipsoid of the section $S^v_{h,p}(x)$. Then

$$\frac{d_{n-1}(h)}{h^{1/2}} \to 0 \text{ as } h \to 0.$$

Proof. By translating and subtracting a linear function assume that $x = p = 0$. Assume by way of contradiction that we can find $h_k \to 0$ and some $\delta > 0$ such that

$$d_{n-1}(h_k) > \delta h_k^{1/2}$$

for all k. We first show that v is trapped by two tangent planes at 0.

Let $x_{1,k}$ and $x_{2,k}$ be the points on $\partial S^v_{h_k,0}(0)$ where the hyperplanes perpendicular to the shortest axis of the John ellipsoid become tangent to $\partial S^v_{h_k,0}(0)$, and let $p_{1,k}$ and $p_{2,k}$ denote subgradients at these points. Since

$$d_1(h_k)d_2(h_k)...d_n(h_k) < Ch_k^{\frac{n+1}{2}},$$

we have that $d_n(h_k) < \frac{C}{\delta^{n-1}}h_k$ for all k. By this observation and convexity we can rotate and pass to a subsequence such that

$$p_{1,k} \to c_1(\delta)e_n, \quad p_{2,k} \to -c_2(\delta)e_n.$$

Then v is trapped by the planes $\pm c(\delta)x_n$. We conclude that

$$S^v_{h_k,0}(0) \subset \{|x_n| < C(\delta)h_k\}.$$

To complete the proof, we show that the volumes of sections obtained with tilted supporting planes are too large. Take the largest a such that $v \geq ax_n$ and consider the sections

$$S_k = S^v_{(1+aC(\delta))h_k,a}(0).$$

Then S_k engulf $S^v_{h_k,0}(0)$. Furthermore,

$$\sup\{|x_n| : x \in S_k\} = R_k h_k,$$

where $R_k \to \infty$ as $k \to \infty$. Indeed, if not, then for some small ϵ and a sequence $b_i \to 0$ we would have $v(x', b_i) > (a+\epsilon)b_i$ for all x'. Convexity and $v(0) = 0$ imply that $v > (a+\epsilon)x_n$ for all $x_n > b_i$, which in turn implies that

$$v > (a+\epsilon)x_n,$$

contradicting the definition of a.

Finally, let $(x'_k, R_k h_k) \in S_k$ be the point in S_k furthest in the e_n direction. Since v grows at least quadratically away from every tangent plane, we have

$$|x'_k| < C(\delta, a)h_k^{1/2}.$$

Recall that

$$S^v_{h_k,0}(0) \subset \{|x_n| < C(\delta)h_k\} \cap B_{h_k^{1/2}}(0).$$

Take any two points in $\{|x_n| < C(\delta)h_k\} \cap B_{h_k^{1/2}}(0)$ a distance $\delta h_k^{1/2}$ apart, take the lines from these points to $(x'_k, R_k h_k)$ and denote the intersections of these lines with $\{x_n = C(\delta)h_k\}$ by y and z. By elementary geometry,

$$|y - z| > (\delta - C(a,\delta)/R_k)h_k^{1/2}.$$

Since $d_i(h_k) > \delta h_k^{1/2}$ for all $i \leq n-1$, it follows that S_k contains the cone with vertex $(x'_k, R_k h_k)$ and base given by a ball of radius $(\delta - C(a,\delta)/R_k)h_k^{1/2}$ on the hyperplane $\{x_n = C(\delta)h_k\}$. We conclude that

$$|S_k| \geq c(\delta, a)R_k h_k^{\frac{n+1}{2}},$$

contradicting our definition of Σ_v for k large. □

Lemma 3.3. *Fix* $x \in \Sigma_v$. *For any* $\epsilon > 0$, *there is a sequence* $r_k \to 0$ *such that*

$$Mv(B_{r_k}(x)) > \frac{1}{\epsilon}r_k^{n-1}.$$

Proof. Fix a subgradient p at x and let $d_1(h), ..., d_n(h)$ be defined as in the statement of Lemma 3.2. Let

$$I = \min\left\{i : \frac{d_i(h)}{h^{1/2}} \to 0 \text{ as } h \to 0\right\}.$$

Fix δ small. Then we can find a sequence $h_k \to 0$ and η depending only on p such that

$$d_I(h_k) < \delta h_k^{1/2},$$

and $d_i(h_k) > \eta h_k^{1/2}$ for all $i < I$. Rotate the axes so that the e_i are the axes for the John ellipsoid of $S^v_{h_k,p}(x)$ and assume by translation that $x = 0$.

Take the restriction of v to the subspace spanned by $e_I, ..., e_n$, and call this restriction w. Let

$$S^w_k = S^v_{h_k,p}(x) \cap \{x_1 = ... = x_{I-1} = 0\},$$

the slice of the section $S^v_{h_k,p}(x)$ in this subspace. Then since

$$d_1(h_k)d_2(h_k)...d_n(h_k) \leq Ch_k^{\frac{n+1}{2}}$$

and v grows at most quadratically in the first $I - 1$ directions, we have

$$|S^w_k|_{\mathcal{H}^{n-I+1}} \leq \frac{C}{\eta^{(I-1)/2}} h_k^{\frac{n+2-I}{2}}.$$

Using this and Lemma 2.4,

$$Mw(S^w_k) \geq c\eta^{(I-1)/2} h_k^{\frac{n-I}{2}}.$$

Finally, let $r_k = C(n)d_I(h_k)$, with $C(n)$ taken large enough that

$$S^w_k \subset B_{r_k/2}(x).$$

By strict quadratic growth in all directions, $\nabla v(B_{r_k}(x))$ contains a ball of radius $r_k/2$ around every point in $\nabla v(S^w_k)$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} Mv(B_{r_k}(x)) &\geq c(n)Mw(S^w_k)r_k^{I-1} \\ &\geq ch_k^{\frac{n-I}{2}} r_k^{I-1} \\ &\geq \frac{c}{\delta^{n-I}} r_k^{n-1}. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 3.2 we have $I \leq n - 1$, so the conclusion follows. □

We can complete the proof of theorem 3.1 with a covering argument.

Proof of Theorem 3.1: Fix ϵ small. By Lemma 3.3, for each $x \in \Sigma_v$ we can choose an arbitrarily small r such that

$$Mv(B_r(x)) > \frac{1}{\epsilon} r^{n-1}.$$

Cover $\Sigma_v \cap B_{1/2}$ with such balls, and choose a Vitali subcover $\{B_{r_i}(x_i)\}_{i=1}^N$, i.e. a disjoint subcollection such that $B_{3r_i}(x_i)$ cover $\Sigma \cap B_{1/2}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^N (3r_i)^{n-1} &\leq C\epsilon \sum_{i=1}^N Mv(B_{r_i}(x_i)) \\ &\leq C\epsilon, \end{aligned}$$

since v is locally Lipschitz and the B_{r_i} are disjoint. This means exactly that

$$\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\Sigma_v \cap B_{1/2}) = 0.$$

□

Remark 3.4. Replacing Σ_v with

$$\Sigma_v^k = \{|S_{h,p}^v| < C_p h^{\frac{n+k}{2}}\}, \quad 1 \leq k \leq n-1$$

and replacing 1 with k in the preceding, one obtains that $\mathcal{H}^{n-k}(\Sigma_v^k) = 0$. If $\det D^2 u \geq 1$, such growth happens for $v = u + \frac{1}{2}|x|^2$ at points where u agrees with a linear function on a k-dimensional subspace. This shows that the Hausdorff dimension of the k-dimensional singularities is at most $n-k$. In particular, we recover Lemma 2.3 since for $k \geq \frac{n}{2}$ we would have a k-dimensional singularity with Hausdorff k-dimensional measure 0.

4. Examples

In this section we construct examples of solutions to $\det D^2 u = 1$ in $\mathbb{R}^3$ such that Σ has Hausdorff dimension as close to 2 as we like. A small modification produces the analagous examples in $\mathbb{R}^n$.

For this section, fix $\delta > 0$ small. We construct our examples in several steps, which we briefly describe:

(i) First, we construct functions w with

$$\det D^2 w \geq 1$$

in $\mathbb{R}^3$ that degenerate along $\{x_1 = x_2 = 0\}$ and behave like $x_1^{2-\delta}$ along the x_1 axis.

(ii) Next, we construct a standard $S \subset [-1, 1]$ with Hausdorff dimension close to 1 and a convex function v on $[-1, 1]$ such that for any $x \in S$, there is a tangent line such that v separates from this line faster than $r^{2-\delta}$.

(iii) Finally, we get our example by solving the Dirichlet problem

$$\det D^2 u = 1 \quad \text{in } \Omega = \{|x'| < 1\} \times [-1, 1], \qquad u|_{\partial\Omega} = C(\delta)(v(x_1) + |x_2|)$$

and comparing with w at points in $S \times \{0\} \times \{\pm 1\}$.

In the following analysis c and C will denote small and large constants depending on δ.

Construction of w: We look for a convex function $w(x_1, x_2, x_3)$ with the homogeneity

$$w(x_1, x_2, x_3) = \frac{1}{\lambda} h(\lambda^{1/\alpha} x_1, \lambda^{1/\beta} x_2)(1 + x_3^2),$$

where α and β satisfy $1 < \alpha, \beta < 2$ and

$$\frac{1}{\alpha} + \frac{1}{\beta} = \frac{3}{2}.$$

(It is easy to check that $\geq 3/2$ is necessary for such a function to have $\det D^2 w$ bounded below). Note that this rescaling preserves the curves $x_2 = m x_1^{\alpha/\beta}$.

Let $f(x)$ denote $1 + x^2$. An obvious candidate for w is

$$w(x_1, x_2, x_3) = (x_1^\alpha + x_2^\beta) f(x_3).$$

One checks that

$$\begin{aligned}\det D^2 w = {} & |x_1|^{2\alpha-2}|x_2|^{\beta-2}\left(\alpha\beta(\alpha-1)(\beta-1)f^2 - \alpha^2\beta(\beta-1)f x_3^2\right) \\ & + |x_1|^{\alpha-2}|x_2|^{2\beta-2}\left(\alpha\beta(\alpha-1)(\beta-1)f^2 - \alpha\beta^2(\alpha-1)f x_3^2\right).\end{aligned}$$

Take $\alpha = 2 - \delta$. Then for $|x_3|$ small depending on δ we have

$$\det D^2 w \geq c(\delta)(|x_1|^{2\alpha-2}|x_2|^{\beta-2} + |x_1|^{\alpha-2}|x_2|^{2\beta-2}).$$

Along the curves $x_2 = m x_1^{\alpha/\beta}$, we compute

$$\det D^2 w \geq c(\delta)(|m|^{\beta-2} + |m|^{2\beta-2}) \geq c(\delta),$$

since $1 < \beta < 2$.

Thus, up to rescaling the x_3-axis and multiplying by a constant, we have

$$\det D^2 w \geq 1 \quad \text{in } \Omega = \{|x'| < 1\} \times [-1, 1].$$

Construction of S: Let $\epsilon > 0$ be a small constant we will choose shortly depending on δ. Construct a self-similar set in $[-1/2, 1/2]$ as follows: First, remove an open interval of length $\gamma = 1 - 2^{-3\epsilon}$ from the center. Proceed inductively by removing intervals a fraction γ of each of those that remains. Denote the centers of the intervals removed at stage k by $\{x_{i,k}\}_{i=1}^{2^k}$, and the intervals by $I_{i,k}$. Finally, let

$$S = [-1/2, 1/2] - \cup_{i,k} I_{i,k}.$$

It is easy to check that $|I_{i,k+1}| = \gamma 2^{-(1+3\epsilon)k}$ and that S has Hausdorff dimension $\frac{1}{1+3\epsilon}$.

Construction of v: Let

$$w(x) = \begin{cases} |x| & |x| \leq 1 \\ 2|x| - 1 & |x| > 1 \end{cases}$$

We add rescalings of w together to produce the desired function:

$$v(x) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{i=1}^{2^k} 2^{-2(1+2\epsilon)k} w(\gamma^{-1} 2^{(1+3\epsilon)k}(x - x_{i,k})).$$

We now check that v satisfies the desired properties:

(i) v is convex, as the sum of convex functions. Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} |v(x)| &\leq C \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{i=1}^{2^k} 2^{-(1+\epsilon)k} \\ &\leq C \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 2^{-\epsilon k}, \end{aligned}$$

so v is bounded.

(ii) Let $x \in S$. We aim to show that v separates from a tangent line more than $r^{2-\delta}$ a distance r from x. By subtracting a line assume that $v(x) = 0$ and that 0 is a subgradient at x. Assume further that $x + r < 1/2$ and that $2^{-(1+3\epsilon)k} < r \leq 2^{-(1+3\epsilon)(k-1)}$. There are two cases to examine:

Case 1: There is some $y \in (x + r/2, x + r) \cap S$. Then by the construction of S it is easy to see that there is some interval $I_{i,k}$ such that $I_{i,k} \subset (x, x + r)$. On this interval, v grows by

$$2^{-2(1+2\epsilon)k} \geq c r^{2\frac{1+2\epsilon}{1+3\epsilon}} = c r^{2-\delta},$$

where we choose ϵ so that

$$\delta = \frac{2\epsilon}{1+3\epsilon}.$$

Case 2: Otherwise, there is an interval $I_{i,j}$ of length exceeding $r/2$ such that $(x+r/2, x+r) \subset I_{i,j}$. Then at the left point of $I_{i,j}$, the slope of v jumps by at least $2^{-(1+\epsilon)k}$. It follows that at $x+r$, v is at least

$$\frac{r}{2}2^{-(1+\epsilon)k} \geq cr^{2-\delta}.$$

Thus, v has the desired properties.

Construction of u: We recall the following lemma on the solvability of the Monge-Ampère equation (see [Gut]).

Lemma 4.1. *If Ω is open and convex, μ is a finite Borel measure and g is continuous on $\partial\Omega$ then there exists a unique convex solution $u \in C(\bar{\Omega})$ to the Dirichlet problem*

$$\det D^2 u = \mu, \quad u|_{\partial\Omega} = g.$$

Let $g(x_1, x_2, x_3) = C(v(x_1) + |x_2|)$ for a constant C depending on δ we will choose shortly, and obtain u by solving the Dirichlet problem

$$\det D^2 u = 1 \quad \text{ in } \Omega = \{|x'| < 1\} \times [-1,1], \qquad u|_{\partial\Omega} = g.$$

Take $x \in S \times \{0\} \times \{\pm 1\}$. By translating and subtracting a linear function assume that $x_1 = 0$ and 0 is a subgradient for g at x. Taking C large we guarantee that

$$g(x_1, x_2, \pm 1) > C(x_1^{2-\delta} + |x_2|) > w(x_1, x_2, \pm 1)$$

for all x_1, x_2, and that that $g > w$ on the sides of Ω. Thus, $u \geq w$ in all of Ω. Since $u = 0$ at both $(0,0,\pm 1)$ and $w(0,0,x_3) = 0$ for all $|x_3| < 1$, we have by convexity that $u = 0$ along $(0,0,x_3)$.

We conclude that Σ contains $S \times \{0\} \times (-1,1)$, which has Hausdorff dimension $1 + \frac{1}{1+3\epsilon} = 2 - \frac{3}{2}\delta$.

Remark 4.2. To get the analagous example in $\mathbb{R}^n$, take

$$u(x_1, x_2, x_3) + x_4^2 + ... + x_n^2.$$

Observe that this solution has exactly the behavior described by Lemma 3.2, which says that u must grow faster than quadratically in two directions. In the next section we show that for any ϵ, these examples are not in $W^{2,1+\epsilon}$ for δ small enough.

5. $W^{2,1}$ Regularity

In this section we obtain $W^{2,1}$ regularity for singular solutions to the Monge-Ampère equation. Furthermore, by examining the examples in the previous section we show that we cannot improve this result to $W^{2,1+\epsilon}$ regularity for an ϵ depending on λ, Λ and n.

The following result of De Philippis, Figalli and Savin (see [DFS]) gives $W^{2,1+\epsilon}$ regularity of solutions to $\lambda \leq \det D^2 u \leq \Lambda$ in compactly contained sections:

Theorem 5.1. *Assume that*

$$\lambda \leq \det D^2 u \leq \Lambda \quad \text{ in } \Omega \text{ and } S_h(x) \subset\subset \Omega.$$

Then $u \in W^{2,1+\epsilon}(S_{h/2}(x))$ *for some* ϵ *depending only on* λ, Λ *and* n.

$W^{2,1}$ regularity then follows from our main theorem.

Proof of Theorem 1.2: Theorem 5.1 gives local $W^{2,1}$ regularity on $\Omega - \Sigma$. By Theorem 1.1, for any $\eta > 0$ we can cover Σ by balls $\{B_{r_i}(x_i)\}$ such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} r_i^{n-1} < \eta.$$

Let $A = \cup_{i=1}^{\infty} B_{r_i}(x_i)$. Since u is a convex function, the second derivatives are controlled by Δu. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_A \|D^2 u\| \, dx &\leq \int_A \Delta u \, dx \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \int_{\partial B_{r_i}} u_\nu \, ds \\ &\leq C \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} r_i^{n-1} \\ &\leq C\eta,\end{aligned}$$

where C is the Lipschitz constant of u. This shows that the second derivatives cannot concentrate on Σ. $\square$

We now examine the integrability of Δu for the examples constructed in the previous section. On any ball B_r, by Hölder's inequality we have

$$\int_{B_r} (\Delta u)^{1+\epsilon} \, dx \geq c(n) r^{-\epsilon n} \left(\int_{B_r} \Delta u \, dx \right)^{1+\epsilon}.$$

Recall that the subsolutions w grow like $x_2^{\beta} = x_2^{1+\frac{\delta}{4-3\delta}}$ in the x_2 direction, and that these functions touch u by below at any $x \in \Sigma = S \times \{0\} \times (-1,1)^{n-2}$. It follows that

$$\sup_{\partial B_r(x)} (u - u(x)) \geq r^{\beta}$$

for any $x \in \Sigma$. Applying convexity,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{B_r(x)} (\Delta u)^{1+\epsilon} \, dx &\geq c(n) r^{-\epsilon n} \left(\int_{\partial B_r} u_\nu \, ds \right)^{1+\epsilon} \\ &\geq c(n) r^{(n+\beta-2)(1+\epsilon) - \epsilon n} \\ &\geq c(n) r^{n-1-\epsilon+(1+\epsilon)\frac{\delta}{3}}.\end{aligned}$$

Fix η small and cover $S \times \{0\} \times (-1,1)^{n-2}$ with balls of radius $r_i < \eta$. Take a Vitali subcover $\{B_{r_i}\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$. It follows that

$$\int_{B_1} (\Delta u)^{1+\epsilon} \, dx \geq c(n) \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} r_i^{n-1-\epsilon+(1+\epsilon)\frac{\delta}{3}}.$$

Taking $\epsilon = 4\delta$ above, we conclude that

$$\int_{B_1} (\Delta u)^{1+\epsilon}\, dx \geq c(n) \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} r_i^{n-1-3\delta},$$

where the expression on the right goes to ∞ as $\eta \to 0$ because the Hausdorff dimension of $S \times \{0\} \times (-1,1)^{n-2}$ is $n-1-\frac{3}{2}\delta$. Thus, Δu is not $L^{1+\epsilon}$ for $\epsilon \geq 4\delta$.

Remark 5.2. In future work we intend to present a more precise version of Theorem 1.1 which gives $L \log L$ regularity of second derivatives of singular solutions to

$$\lambda \leq \det D^2 u \leq \Lambda.$$

6. Unique Continuation

For our proof of unique continuation we rely on the following classical result:

Theorem 6.1. *Assume that* $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ *is a connected open set and* $u \in W^{1,2}_{loc}(\Omega)$ *is a weak solution to the equation*

$$\partial_i(a^{ij}(x)u_j) + b^i(x)u_i + c(x)u = 0,$$

where $a^{ij}(x)$ *is Lipschitz and uniformly elliptic and* $b^i(x), c(x)$ *are bounded measurable. If* $u = 0$ *on some open subset of* Ω*, then* $u \equiv 0$ *in* Ω*.*

A proof can be found in Hörmander's book [H], Theorem 17.2.6. In [AS], the authors use the same theorem to prove unique continuation for fully nonlinear uniformly elliptic equations.

We will apply this result to the difference of u and v, which solves a linear equation where u and v are sufficiently regular. Indeed, suppose u and v are C^2 in a neighborhood of x and let w_t be the convex combination $tu + (1-t)v$. Let $(W_t)^{ij}$ be the matrix of cofactors for $D^2 w_t$. Then by expanding $0 = \int_0^1 \frac{d}{dt} \det D^2 w_t dt$ we get

$$a^{ij}(x)(u-v)_{ij} = 0,$$

where

$$a^{ij}(x) = \int_0^1 (W_t)^{ij}(x)dt.$$

The regularity theory of Caffarelli [C2] allows us to use this observation at points of strict convexity for solutions to the Monge-Ampère equation:

Theorem 6.2. *Assume*

$$\det D^2 u = f \quad \text{in } \Omega, \qquad u|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$$

where $f \in C^{1,\alpha}(\Omega)$ *is strictly positive. Then*

$$u \in C^{3,\alpha}(\Omega).$$

The proof of unique continuation follows easily from these observations and our main theorem.

Proof of Theorem 1.3: Let Σ_u and Σ_v be the singular sets of u and v respectively, and let $A = \Omega - (\Sigma_u \cup \Sigma_v)$. Since A is dense in Ω, it suffices to show that $u = v$ on A.

By Caffarelli's theory ([C1]), A is an open set, and by Theorem 1.1, A is connected. By Theorem 6.2, the difference $u - v$ satisfies the linear equation

$$a^{ij}(x)(u-v)_{ij} = 0$$

on A, where a^{ij} are locally uniformly elliptic and $C^{1,\alpha}$ in A. The conclusion follows from Theorem 6.1. $\square$

References

[AS] Armstrong, S. and Silvestre, L., Unique continuation for fully nonlinear elliptic equations, *Math. Res. Lett.* **18**, no. 5, (2011), 921-926.

[C1] Caffarelli L., A localization property of viscosity solutions to the Monge-Ampère equation and their strict convexity, *Ann. of Math.* **131** (1990), 129-134.

[C2] Caffarelli L., Interior $W^{2,p}$ estimates for solutions of Monge-Ampère equation, *Ann. of Math.* **131** (1990), 135-150.

[C3] Caffarelli L., A note on the degeneracy of convex solutions to the Monge-Ampère equation, *Comm. Partial Diff. Eqns.* **18** (1993), 1213-1217.

[DF] De Philippis, G. and Figalli A., $W^{2,1}$ regularity for solutions of the Monge-Ampère equation, *Invent. Math.*, to appear.

[DFS] De Philippis, G., A. Figalli and O. Savin, A note on interior $W^{2,1+\epsilon}$ estimates for the Monge-Ampère equation, Preprint arXiv:1202.5566, (2012).

[Gut] Gutierrez C., The Monge-Ampère Equation: Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and their Applications 44, Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 2001.

[H] Hörmander L., The Analysis of Linear Partial Differential Operators III, Pseudodifferential Operators: Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften 274, Springer-Verlag, Berlin 1985.

Department of Mathematics, Columbia University, New York, NY 10027
E-mail address: `cmooney@math.columbia.edu`